UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

———————

No. 03-7937

———————

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

COLE LEVAN COLEMAN,

Defendant - Appellant.

———————

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina, at Durham. William L. Osteen, District Judge. (CR-98-139)

———————

Submitted: April 15, 2004   Decided: April 22, 2004

———————

Before NIEMEYER and GREGORY, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

———————

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

———————

Cole Levan Coleman, Appellant Pro Se. Michael Francis Joseph, Assistant United States Attorney, Greensboro, North Carolina, for Appellee.

———————

PER CURIAM:

Cole Levan Coleman, a federal prisoner, seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his motion filed under 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2000). An appeal may not be taken from the final order in a § 2255 proceeding unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1) (2000). A certificate of appealability will not issue for claims addressed by a district court absent "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2) (2000). A prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists would find both that his constitutional claims are debatable and that any dispositive procedural rulings by the district court are also debatable or wrong. See Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 336 (2003); Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); Rose v. Lee, 252 F.3d 676, 683 (4th Cir. 2001). We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Coleman has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. We grant Coleman's motion to file a supplemental brief. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED